

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/482,054	MARGON, KENNETH
	Examiner Steven Nguyen	Art Unit 2665

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Huy Vu (Supervisor) (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Trevor Coddington (Patent Agent) (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 2/13/04

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kashi (5682,604) & Serfaty (5572546)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: \_\_\_\_\_.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

*Discussed 103 rejections of claim 1 over Kashi in view of Serfaty. Explained positions of examiner with respect to claim 1. Discussed combination and motivation to combine the two references.*

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required